

REMARKS

Claims 11-18 are pending in this application, of which claim 11 is independent.

Initially, we thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on June 20, 2006. Although no conclusion was reached with regard to the allowability of the claims, we have amended claim 11 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter we regard as our invention. Support for the amendments to claim 11 can be found in the specification at pages 24, 25 and Figure 20. We request reconsideration of this application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

Independent claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Livingston et al., U.S. Patent 6,424,979 (Livingston) in view of Underwood et al., U.S. Patent 6,601,057 (Underwood). We submit that Livingston and Underwood, either alone or in combination, would not have rendered obvious a document authoring system including a server with “a matching list in which the plurality of identification information corresponding to the objects to be edited are stored in association together with the plurality of display information to be displayed,” as recited in amended claim 11.

Livingston describes that “the outline lists the various sections and content that will be assembled by the system to generate the page, as well as the style sheet that will be integrated with the final page to control the way it is rendered” (column 11, lines 38-41). The outline is “expressed in XML” as a hierarchical tree (column 11, lines 42-44). Rules of a style sheet are incorporated by reference into the XML page, “so they exist separate from the XML” (column 12, lines 16-19).

In sum, the Livingston system uses information from the parent and style sheet to generate and render, respectively, the web page. However, Livingston does not render obvious that the information used to generate and render include identification information corresponding to objects to be edited. Indeed, if the parent and style sheet **generate** and then **render** the web page, it would not render obvious our claimed feature directed toward objects to be **edited** on an already generated web page. That is, one would not edit objects of a web page before the web page is first generated and rendered.

Moreover, Livingston describes the rules of the style sheet are incorporated **by reference** into the XML page, and exist **separately** from the XML. It is unclear whether the rules of the style sheet include either identification information of objects to be edited or display information. Even if this were the case (a point we do not concede), claim 11 recites that the plurality of identification information corresponding to the objects to be edited are stored in association **together** with the plurality of display information to be displayed. We submit that it would be beyond the plain meanings of the terms “separate” and “together” to read Livingston on this claimed limitation.

The Examiner cited Underwood for its alleged disclosure of (1) means for displaying a plurality of objects to be edited and a plurality of identification corresponding to the objects to be edited, respectively, on a web screen; (2) a plurality of objects and a plurality of identification information described in a first language; and (3) a client including means for displaying the converted display information transmitted from the server in an edit window, according to a type of the object to be edited, for editing and converted display information (see Office Action, pages 11 and 12). However, we submit that Underwood does not remedy the deficiencies of Livingston described above. That is, Underwood is not understood to disclose a document authoring system including a server with “a matching list in which the plurality of identification information corresponding to the objects to be edited are stored in association together with the plurality of display information to be displayed,” as recited in amended claim 11.

It is believed that all issues raised regarding the pending claims have been addressed. The absence, however, of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a Enter \$ amount check for excess claim fees and a Enter \$ amount check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Hiroshi Takizawa et al.
Serial No. : 10/622,029
Filed : July 17, 2003
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13357-003002 / 6YS-02S1048
CIP

Date: 7-27-06

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21370048.doc

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin Su
Reg. No. 57,377